arXiv:1703.08671v1 [astro-ph.HE] 25 Mar 2017

Towards solving the mass-composition problem in ultra high energy cosmic rays

Roberto Aloisio*
Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy
INAF - Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri, Firenze, Italy
INFN - Laboratori Nazionali Gran Sasso, Assergi (AQ), Italy.

Veniamin Berezinsky†
Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy
INFN - Laboratori Nazionali Gran Sasso, Assergi (AQ), Italy.

(Dated: March 28, 2017)

Using the Auger analysis on mass composition of ultra high energy cosmic rays based on the shape-fitting of X_{max} distributions [1], we show that mass composition and energy spectra measured by Auger, Telescope Array and HiRes can be brought to a good agreement. The shape-fitting analysis of X_{max} distributions shows that the measured sum of proton and Helium fractions for some hadronic interaction models can saturate the total flux. The most radical assumption of the present work is the unreliability of the experimental separation of Helium and protons, which allows to consider He/p ratio as a free parameter. The results presented show that models with dominant p+He composition explain well the dip in the latest (2015) data of Auger and Telescope Array, but have some tension at the highest energies with the expectations of the the Greisen-Zatsepin-Kutzmin cutoff.

PACS numbers: 9870.Sa,9850sb,9650.sd,12.60.Jv

I. INTRODUCTION

Mass composition is the most controversial problem which at present blocks the study of ultra high energy cosmic rays (UHECR) from further successful development. The three biggest detectors, Pierre Auger (referred here as 'Auger'), Telescope Array (referred as 'TA') and HiRes, have obtained contradictory results concerning mass composition of primary particles in the energy range (3 - 100) EeV (1 EeV $= 1 \times 10^{18}$ eV). At (1-3) EeV all three detectors agree with light composition, protons or protons and Helium, but in the range (3 - 100) EeV the Auger detector, the biggest one, founds a progressively heavier mass composition with increasing energy, reaching probably Iron at the end of the spectrum, while the other two detectors report the same mass composition as at lower energy.

At present there are two basic methods to study the mass composition of UHECR: direct measurements and indirect tests. The more reliable direct method is based on the observation of the fluorescent light produced by Extensive Air Showers (EAS) in the atmosphere. The indirect test is based on the signatures of mass composition in the primary energy spectrum and we start with it as more old and less constraining.

This approach works most efficiently for protons due to their interaction with the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB). It results in two very specific spectral features: the Greisen-Zatsepin-Kuzmin (GZK) cutoff [2] and the pair-production dip. The former is a sharp cutoff at the end of the spectrum, around $E \sim 50$ EeV, due to the photo-pion production and the latter is a rather faint feature at $E \sim 1 - 30$ EeV first calculated in [3] and studied in detail in [4–6]. The dip is well confirmed in the spectra of all three detectors but its origin as the pair-production dip $p + \gamma_{cmb} \to p + e^- + e^+$ is questioned by the Auger mass composition. Before 2013 the data published by Auger, TA and HiRes showed an energy position of the high energy cutoff in good agreement with the predicted GZK cutoff. Nevertheless, the newest data of Auger and TA, released in 2015, seem to be in contradiction with this interpretation [7].

The propagation of UHE *nuclei* does not leave any clear signature of the mass composition in the energy spectra. The main channel of energy losses, that determines the spectrum of UHE nuclei, is the photo-disintegration process on the Extragalactic Background Light (EBL) and on CMB. This process naturally produces the secondary lighter nuclei mixing thus with the primary composition. As was first predicted by Gerasimova and Rozental [8] in 1961, i.e.

*Electronic address: roberto.aloisio@gssi.it
†Electronic address: berezinsky@lngs.infn.it

before discovery of CMB, nuclei photo-disintegration on EBL results in a suppression of UHECR energy spectrum (GR steepening). In fact, as was realised later, see e.g. [9], a more sharp cutoff occurs at higher energies where the nucleus photo-disintegration time on CMB becomes equal to that on EBL. This cutoff arises at Lorenz-factor $\Gamma \sim (3-5)\times 10^9$ for all nuclei. The energy of the cutoff $E_{cut} \propto A\Gamma$ is different for primary nuclei with different A. This fact together with the unavoidable mixed composition, due to the production of secondary nuclei makes unclear any composition signature in the observed spectrum.

At present the best method to measure the mass composition is given by the observation of fluorescent light produced by the e-m component of EAS in the atmosphere. All three aforementioned detectors use this method. However, for better accuracy the fluorescent-light method needs additional information, which in the case of HiRes is given by the stereo observation of fluorescent light, and in the case of Auger (and recently TA) this additional information is obtained from the data of on-ground detectors (water-Cherenkov detectors in Auger and scintillation detectors in TA).

The basic observable parameter related to mass composition is $X_{\max}(E)$, the atmospheric depth where the number $N(E)$ of particles in the cascade, with total energy E, reaches its maximum. $X_{\max}$, is sensitive to the number of nucleons in the primary nucleus. Heavy nuclei interact higher in the atmosphere and have smaller fluctuations. In practice the actual quantity which allows to find the mass composition is the distribution $N(X_{\max})$ of the showers with total energy E.

In the case of large statistics the direct use of $N(X_{\max}, E)$ gives the most reliable estimation of composition. In the case of limited statistics one may use the moments of this distribution, see e.g [10], namely the first moment which is the mean value $\langle X_{\max}\rangle$ and the second moment $\sigma(X_{\max})$ which is the variance or dispersion (RMS) of the distribution. As was demonstrated in [1] using only the first two moments for the analysis, may result in a false degeneracy: two different mass compositions may produce the same $\langle X_{\max}\rangle$ and $\sigma(X_{\max})$.

The shape-fitting analysis of $N(X_{max})$ recently performed by the Auger collaboration [1] gives very important results that, summarising, can be described as follows. The mass composition is assumed as a discrete sum of four elements: Iron (Fe), Nitrogen (N), Helium (He) and protons (p). For each element the $X_{\max}$ distribution is calculated by Monte Carlo (MC) simulations and the fraction of each element in the total flux is found from the comparison with observations. These fractions depend on models of hadronic interaction included in MC simulations. A decisive result is given by the very small fraction of Iron at all energies, almost independently of the hadronic interaction models (see the upper panel of Fig. 4 in [1]). Besides, the analysis of [1] shows that the fraction of light elements (p+He) is quite large independently of the hadronic interaction models. It allows the conclusion that at least a large fraction of UHECR, if not the dominant one, is composed by light elements. The small fraction of Iron and large of p+He seem to be the common conclusion of shape-fitting analysis of Auger and HiRes/TA experiments.

The argument above does not dismiss the question: Auger, HiRes and TA use the same fluorescent data to measure $X_{\max}$ and the same moments-based method for the analysis of mass composition. Why then their conclusions differ? The most convincing answer to this question is probably given in a recent paper by TA collaboration [11]. The observation of fluorescence light can be performed in two ways: with a monocular observation, when only one telescope observes the fluorescent signal, or in the stereo mode when more than one telescope simultaneously observe the same shower. Fluorescence detection in monocular mode is less efficient to measure $X_{\max}$ in comparison with the stereo mode. HiRes and later TA used, apart from monocular, also stereo events with higher precision in the measurement of $X_{\max}$. It became possible because of the smaller (in comparison with Auger) spatial separation between telescopes. Auger, on the other side, to cover a larger area has a much larger separation among telescopes and collected mainly monocular fluorescent events. Instead, Auger collaboration invented and elaborated the hybrid technique based on additional accompanying signal from at least one on-ground water-Cherenkov detector. Hybrid method allows to measure the core location and geometry of the shower, which improve the measurement precision for $X_{\max}$ and shower energy E. The difference in stereo and hybrid technique can be the reason for the differences in Auger and TA/HiRes data. At present Auger collected the largest number of hybrid events and we compare our predictions with the hybrid Auger data whenever this is possible.

At present TA is also using the hybrid technique with the help of 507 on-ground scintillation detectors [11] and now this experiment has accumulated the data for 5 years. TA reports [11] that the hybrid measurements of $X_{\max}$ agree with the results of Auger, if analysed with the EPOS-LHC hadronic interaction model [12]. On the other hand, using the QGSJetII-03 hadronic interaction model [13] the TA collaboration founds a mass composition compatible with only light nuclei.

Another important method to measure the mass composition is given by muons.

The basic effect to distinguish a nucleus from a proton with the help of muons is related to the different energy per nucleon, E/A, at fixed total energy E. A low energy nucleon produces low energy charged pions which decay to muons before the parent pion undergoes new collisions with air-nucleus.

Produced in EAS, muons propagate rectilinearly with velocity $v \approx c$. As a result they can provide directional and time information, which can further reduce uncertainties in the fluorescent method. There are two well known muon

quantities relevant for measuring mass composition: The total number of muons in a shower N_μ and the so-called Muon Production Depth (MPD) $X^\mu_{\rm max}$, which gives the atmospheric depth where the production rate of muons reaches its maximum [14–16].

The total number of muons N_μ, called also the muon size of the shower, is especially important to determine mass composition at energies below the UHECR regime $< 10^{17}$ eV, where the fluorescent emission is too faint to be detected. At these energies, N_μ gives the only way to determine the mass composition. The analysis of the muon component in the KASCADE-Grande experiment [17] allowed recently to find the Iron knee in the Galactic cosmic ray spectrum at energy $E \sim 1 \times 10^{17}$ eV as predicted by the rigidity relation [18].

Among the three biggest UHECR arrays only Auger can detect muons and measure the muon quantities discussed above. The Auger experiment has several unique possibilities to measure the muon flux directly and use it to determine the mass composition. The on-ground water-Cherenkov detectors can measure muons in inclined directions, although with a high level of uncertainty due to decoupling of the electron and muon signals. In the AMIGA (Auger Muon and Infill Ground Array) array there are muon detectors in the form of scintillation counters buried at a depth of 2.3m underground [19]. Moreover, the Auger Prime [20] upgrade, recently funded, has been specifically designed to improve muons detection in the whole energy range of the experiment. Each tank will be equipped with scintillator layers on the top. Shower particles will be sampled by two detectors (scintillators and water-Cherenkov) having different responses to the muonic and electromagnetic components, thus allowing to reconstruct each of them separately.

We discussed above the problem of measuring the mass composition. Somewhat different question is whether it is possible to exclude, on the basis of observations, a pure proton composition at $E > 3$ EeV. There are two challengers for such task: the quasi-isotropic gamma-radiation and neutrinos both produced in collisions of UHECR protons with background photons. The most stringent limit on the isotropic component of gamma-radiation in the range 50 MeV - 820 GeV is given by the Fermi-LAT experiment [21]. The strongest upper limit on the allowed UHE proton flux was obtained practically simultaneously in 2016 in three works [22–24]. The limit depends on the models for sources of UHECR, especially strongly on the injection power-law index γ_g and cosmological evolution of sources. In [24] it was demonstrated that in a wide range of parameters the proton models which explain UHECR flux and spectrum, predict gamma-rays and neutrinos below the Fermi-LAT upper limit and IceCube flux.

In the present paper we use the latest Auger and TA observations, comparing them with the spectral features that arise due to propagation of UHECR, and their mass composition.

We argue that the spectral features may still be considered as an indication for a light mass composition, solving the problem of the alleged discrepancy between Auger and TA observations. The paper is organised as follows: In section II we reconsider the status of the dip model in light of the latest observations of the spectrum. In section III we show how a mixture of Helium nuclei and protons provide a good description of the observed flux. In section IV we discuss the correlation of $X_{\rm max}$ with muon characteristics: N_μ, the total number of muons in a shower, and $X^{\rm max}_\mu$, the Muon Production Depth; for this discussion we calculated the spectrum in the model p+He+CNO. The conclusion is given in section V.

II. MODIFICATION FACTOR AS INDICATION OF PROTON-DOMINATED COMPOSITION

Propagating through CMB the proton energy spectrum acquires two characteristic features: the dip, due to the reaction $p + \gamma_{\rm cmb} \to p + e^- + e^+$ [3], and GZK cutoff [2] due to the reaction $p + \gamma_{\rm cmb} \to N + \pi$. These two features are quite different from the spectral features arising in the flux of UHE nuclei due to the interaction with CMB and EBL. This difference can be used to distinguish the flux of protons and nuclei and can be considered as an additional (indirect) test of the mass composition to be compared with observations.

This test becomes particularly important in the light of the uncertainties in the direct measurements of the mass composition and in the hadronic interaction models at energies above the CERN calibrations.

In this section we use the modification-factor method to identify protons in UHECR. Following the works [4–6], it can be proved that this method favours a proton-dominated mass composition in the observations of four experiments: AGASA, Yakutsk, HiRes and Auger, using the data before 2009 (TA data of 2011 agree with the calculated modification factor too). Here we reconsider this analysis in light of the higher statistics data of Auger and TA as published in 2015 [25, 26]. We will show that the new data confirm the agreement with the dip and show noticeable differences with the GZK cutoff (see Fig. 1).

The modification factor is defined as the ratio:

$$\eta_p(E) = \frac{J_p(E)}{J_p^{\rm unm}(E)}, \tag{1}$$

where $J_p(E)$ is the total flux of protons, measured or calculated, taking into account all energy losses due to $p\gamma_{\rm cmb}$ collisions and adiabatic energy losses. In Eq.(1) we introduced also the unmodified proton spectrum $J_p^{\rm unm}(E)$ which



FIG. 1: Proton modification factor with 2015 data of TA (left panel) and Auger (right panel). The theoretical modification factor is computed assuming pure protons, no cosmological evolution of sources, an injection power-law index $\gamma_g = 2.6$ and the maximum acceleration energy $E_{max} = 10^{21}$ eV.

is calculated taking into account only adiabatic energy losses.

Model-dependent phenomena enter both numerator and denominator of Eq.(1) and compensate or even cancel each other, while interaction with CMB photons does not enter the unmodified flux, i.e. denominator, and appears only in the numerator of Eq. (1). Thus the modification factor presents, in an unsuppressed way, such features as dip and GZK cutoff directly linked to the propagation of UHE protons, while model-dependent features are seen there in a suppressed form. Therefore the modification factor is an excellent instrument to search for the proton-dominated mass composition through proton interaction features, dip and GZK cutoff, but it is not sensitive to the details of the acceleration models.

The comparison of the proton modification factor with the data of five experiments released before 2011, namely AGASA, Yakutsk, HiRes, Auger and TA, results in an excellent agreement with the observed spectra in approximately 100 energy bins [4–6]. It is a remarkable fact that this agreement is achieved with only one free parameter, the injection power-law index $\gamma_g \approx 2.6$, together with sources emissivity $\mathcal{L}_0$, which provides the total normalisation of the flux. In Fig. 1 we compare the theoretical modification factor for protons with the Auger and TA data of 2015. The Auger spectrum plotted in Fig. 1 is obtained only from hybrid measurements, being less affected by systematic errors compared to the combined spectrum. Concerning TA data there is no hybrid spectrum published yet and in Fig. 1 we plotted the combined spectrum. The comparison of Fig. 1 shows a fairly good agreement with the dip in both datasets, the relatively small discrepancy with GZK cutoff for Auger and stronger discrepancy with GZK cutoff for TA. We postpone the discussion of such discrepancies to a forthcoming publication, just signalling here the simplest explanation that Auger hybrid spectrum is less affected by systematic errors in comparison with the combined spectrum of TA.

In more general terms the good agreement of the proton theoretical modification factor with Auger and TA observations, at least at the dip energies $1 - 30$ EeV, is a strong indication of proton or proton-dominated composition. However, one cannot consider it as the the final proof. Indeed, on one side we observe the unique shape of the dip produced by $p + \gamma_{\rm cmb} \to p + e^- + e^+$ scattering. On the other side, in models with mixed nuclei composition, see for instance [27], one can obtain a theoretical spectrum with practically the same shape of the pair-production dip, but using more than 10 free parameters in the theoretical model. This result demonstrates that the very specific shape of the pair-production dip does not guarantee a unique proof for a proton-dominated composition.

As discussed in the Introduction, there are a few other observations that can in principle challenge the proton-dominated mass composition: the Auger observations on mass composition through fluorescence and muon signals, the Fermi LAT data on the diffuse gamma-ray background and the IceCube data on astrophysical neutrinos. If all these experiments provide in future evidences against the proton-dominated composition one must conclude that the pair-production dip is an accidental coincidence. Nevertheless, until experimental data are not conclusive one must consider the proton modification factor as an indication for a proton-dominated mass composition of UHECR.



FIG. 2: Fraction of p+He nuclei relative to the total one according to measurements [1] with error bars (summed in quadrature) taken from Fig. 4 there, and using the models of interaction Sibyll2.1 (black), QGSJETII-4 (blue) and EPOS-LHC (red).

III. $p + He$ MODEL

As discussed in the Introduction the three biggest experiments, Auger, TA and HiRes, disagree on the measured mass composition at $E > 3$ EeV. In this Section we first summarise the basic physics of mass composition measurements, described in the Introduction, and then present calculations relevant to the $p + He$ model.

The measurement of mass composition is based on the $X_{\max}$ value, which is the depth of the atmosphere where the number of particles in the shower reaches its maximum. The value of $X_{\max}$ is a basic parameter to determine the mass composition of UHECR, while the best observable quantity for this determination is given by the shape of the distribution $N(X_{\max})$ for showers with fixed total energy E.

As a matter of fact, until recently, instead of the distribution $N(X_{\max})$, the first two moments of the distribution were used: the mean value $\langle X_{\max}\rangle$ and its RMS $\sigma(X_{\max})$.

In two recent papers by the Auger collaboration the mass-compositions obtained using moments-analysis [10] and shape-fitting $N(X_{max})$ analysis [1] are not identical. Realistically they are not expected to be such, similarly to the already known fact that $\langle X_{\max}\rangle$ and $\sigma(X_{\max})$ give, if analysed separately, somewhat different results. The shape-fitting analysis is obviously the most fundamental and most sensitive method, since, for example, it involves the tiny parts of the wing distribution. Apart from it, the shape-fitting analysis demonstrated a *degeneration effect* when two different mass compositions correspond to the same first two moments. For this reason, in the present paper, we choose the results coming from the shape-fitting analysis of the Auger data [1] with the measured fractions of four nuclei species: Fe, N, He and p. These fractions, as determined from Auger measurements [1], reveal some uncertainties due to different hadronic interaction models namely QGSJet [13], EPOS-LHC [12] and Sybill [28].

The important result obtained in [1] is given by a very small fraction of Iron at all energies and for all interaction models, except EPOS-LHC at the two highest energy bins (see the upper panel in Fig. 4 of [1]). The other important result, as mentioned in Introduction, and exposed in Fig. 2, is a large fraction of p+He, consistent with unity. It is interesting to note that both effects have a natural cosmological explanation.

Among the heaviest nuclei, Iron is the most natural element to be produced in Super Nova (SN) explosions and the absence of Iron in UHECR implies that other heavy elements must be absent too. Their suppression in the form $Fe/p \ll 1$ is very natural in the case of extragalactic gas and in extragalactic cosmic rays. Enhancement of p+He component has the same nature.

At the cosmological epoch of *recombination*, protons and Helium nuclei were the dominant components and heavy metals were almost completely absent. Production of metals is compulsory. It is needed to provide cooling of ordinary stars during their evolution, including the preSN phase. The stage of *reionization* in the universe, as detected by WMAP [29] and Planck [30] satellites occurs at redshift $z = 11.0 \pm 1.4$ and $z \lesssim 10.0$, respectively. This stage needs at least two early generations of stars with low metallicity, Pop III and Pop II stars. These stars inject in the extragalactic space a small amount of heavy metals. The main contribution to the Iron observed in the extragalactic space (and thus in extragalactic cosmic rays) is given by the present-time SN explosions. This scenario is confirmed by WMAP and Planck observations of the Universe reionization and by the observations in $Ly\alpha$ forest which indicate that extragalactic space had very low fraction of heavy elements at the level $Z \sim 10^{-3.5} Z_{\odot}$ at redshift $z \sim 5$ [31]. Iron



FIG. 3: *Upper panel:* Energy spectrum (left) and modification factor (right) for mixed p+He composition with generation index $\gamma = 2.6$, $E^{acc}_{max} = 10^{21}$ eV and He/p=0.15 in the generation spectrum. The contribution of He is shown by magenta curves, proton by green and total by red. The calculated spectrum is compared with hybrid data of Auger 2015.
Lower panel: The same as above in comparison with TA combined data. The agreement needs a rescaling of the total flux by a factor 1.2. One may notice the excess of TA flux at energy above the GZK cutoff.

and other heavy metals are injected into the extragalactic space mainly during a short interval Δz at $z \sim 0$ mostly due to explosions of the last generation of SNe.

Shock acceleration of Iron nuclei and heavy metals in the extragalactic space is density-suppressed in comparison with normal galaxies. Light elements, proton and Helium, are not limited by this argument and thus only Iron suppression appears in Auger data [1]. The lack of Iron and the excess of p+He in the Auger observations softens the conflict between Auger and HiRes/TA mass composition.

In our calculations an additional simplifying assumption is used. Generically, we assume that all existing detectors do not distinguish reliably Helium from proton and one can consider p+He flux as one light component, assuming the fraction He/p as a free parameter of the model. However, we will start with the sum p+He as it comes from Fig. 4 (strip 3 for He and strip 4 for p) of [1]. Summing these two fractions, with errors summed in quadrature, we obtain p+He flux presented in Fig. 2. One can see that the sum of these two components saturates well the total flux, at least in the case of QGSJet and Sybil hadronic interaction models. This interesting fact confirms well our assumption that the light fraction (p+He) weakly depends on energy and with good accuracy saturates the total flux leaving small room for other components (e.g. N which will be consider later as CNO component).

We are ready now to calculate the energy spectra for $p + He$ models and to compare them with spectra released by Auger and TA in 2015. We consider a power-law generation spectrum as $Q(E) = K_i E^{-\gamma_g}$ $(i = p,\ He)$ with the same generation index γ_g for protons and Helium nuclei. We also assume that sources are distributed homogeneously and uniformly, so that the calculated spectrum is universal, i.e. not being affected by propagation models. Energy losses include pair-production, photo-pion production, and photo-dissociation for Helium. Secondary protons from He and D photo-dissociation and also from neutron decays are included in calculations. For interaction with EBL photons the model [32] is used. In all these calculations we follow [27].

In Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 the computed spectra for $p + He$ models are presented for $\gamma_g = 2.6$ and $\gamma_g = 2.2$ respectively. A generic feature of $p + He$ spectra is the proton dominance at the highest energies because of the GR steepening for Helium at $E \lesssim 5 \times 10^{18}$ eV due to photo-disintegration on EBL. Therefore the GZK cutoff in $p + He$ model becomes



FIG. 4: The same as in Fig. 3 but for $\gamma_g = 2.2$, $E_{max} = 8 \times 10^{19}$ eV and a ratio of protons and Helium nuclei at the source He/p=0.35.

compulsory, unless the maximum acceleration energy $E^{\rm acc}_{\rm max}$ is below the GZK threshold $E^{\rm GZK}_{\rm max} \simeq 50$ EeV.

Consider first the case of generation index $\gamma_g = 2.6$ shown in Fig. 3. This generation index corresponds to the canonical proton modification factor in the dip model (see section II). Therefore if to take a small He/p ratio at generation one should obtain the theoretical spectrum and theoretical modification factor in agreement with old (before 2010) observations. One may notice from Fig. 3 the similar agreement between theoretical curves and observations of Auger 2015 (hybrid data) and TA 2015 (combined data). This agreement becomes worse at the highest energies.

In Fig. 3 we plot in the left panels the comparison with the observed flux and in the right panels with the modification factor. It is remarkable that, at the dip energies, the TA spectrum can be described just rescaling by a factor 1.2 the source emissivity needed to describe the Auger data. The behaviour of the flux at the highest energies is determined by the photo-pion production process. The maximum acceleration energy in Fig. 3 is taken at the level of $E_{max} = 10^{21}$ eV. In other words the theoretical flux behaviour of Fig. 3 is exactly as predicted in the case of the GZK cutoff and, as follows from Fig. 3, it seems not well reproduced in both data sets. Auger shows an earlier cutoff at energies below the GZK cutoff energy ($\simeq 50$ EeV) while TA shows a flux suppression at energies slightly higher than this value.

The fraction of Helium allowed at the sources depends on the assumptions for the injection power-law index. Assuming harder spectra it is possible to increase the fraction of Helium. In Fig. 4 we assume a maximum acceleration energy $E_{max} = 8 \times 10^{19}$ eV and a flatter injection spectrum with $\gamma_g = 2.2$, that allows to increase the fraction of Helium nuclei in the generation spectrum up to $K_{He}/K_p = 0.35$. This procedure improved but a little the agreement with observational data of Auger at the highest energies, while the good agreement with the dip remains practically as before. These changes are linked with the GR steepening of He spectrum due to photo-disintegration on the EBL radiation.

IV. $X_{\rm max}$ AND MUONS

As discussed in the Introduction, the observation of the muon component of showers is a very efficient tool to measure mass composition. The total number of muons N_μ in the shower and also the Muon Production Depth



FIG. 5: Energy spectrum of protons, Helium and CNO with generation ratio 1:0.2:0.1, spectral injection index $\gamma_g = 2.2$ and maximum energy of acceleration $E_{\max} = 8 \times 10^{19}$ eV. The calculations are compared with the 2015 release of hybrid data of Auger (left panel) and combined data of TA (right panel).

$X^{\mu}_{\max}$ are important characteristics. These two values are expected to have correlations with $X_{\max}$, measured in the fluorescent light, because these three quantities characterise the mass composition. Among the three biggest arrays only Auger can measure reliably muon flux and correlations of N_μ and $X^{\mu}_{\max}$ with $X_{\max}$.

To pursue such measurement achieving a better determination of mass composition, the Auger collaboration just started an overall upgrade of the experimental set-up (Auger Prime) to instrument each water-Cherenkov detector with plastic scintillators on top [20], so to better disentangle the signals coming from muons and electrons.

From the theoretical point of view, P. Younk and M. Risse [33] were the first to demonstrate that the statistical correlation of shower maximum depth $X_{\max}$ and the total number of muons N_μ in the shower, depends on the mixture of different nuclei species in the UHECR flux and thus can be used for the analysis of the mass composition. This is a transparent theoretical idea, because both quantities are well known characteristics of the mass composition measured, however, in two independent experimental ways. In [33], the authors introduced the statistical correlation factor r, see Eq.(1) in [33], for the two quantities $X_{\max}$ and N_μ and demonstrated that r is very sensitive to single nuclei composition and their mixtures. For example, a pure proton and a pure Iron composition gives $r_p = 0.0$ and $r_{\rm Fe} = 0.7$ respectively, while for equal ratios of both nuclei $r_{p+Fe} = -0.51$. These numbers are given in the case of an 'ideal detector', for a realistic detector the difference is smaller. This example demonstrates the power of this method to shed some light on the actual mass composition of UHECR.

Recently, restricting the analysis to hybrid events, the Auger collaboration published the measurement of the correlation between the depth of shower maximum X_{max}, as observed by fluorescence telescopes, and the signal in the water-Cherenkov detectors [34]. The surface array of these detectors is sensitive to muons, particularly in the case of inclined showers with zenith angles between 20 and 90 degrees in which muons provide about 40% to 90% of the signal $S(1000)$ at a distance from the shower core of 1000 m. Therefore, in [34], as correlation quantities, were used $X^*_{\max}$ and S^*_{38}, which are the values of $X_{\max}$ and $S(1000)$ recalculated to a shower zenith angle of 38° and for shower energies of 10 EeV. The statistical correlation factor measured and simulated in this way is denoted in [34] as $r_G(X^*_{\max}, S^*_{38})$. The measured value obtained is $r_G^{\rm data} = -0.125 \pm 0.024$ (negative), while the simulated value of the correlation factor for pure protons (p) and for a mixture of protons and Helium (0.8p+0.2He) was found approximately $r_G \approx 0$, for all three hadronic interaction models considered EPOS-LHC, QGSJetII-04 and Sibyll 2.1. This result seems to exclude both a pure proton model and a proton model with an admixture of 20% He. Moreover, also a pure He model is excluded by this analysis. However, the muon excess recently found in the Auger data [35] questions the accuracy of the measurement of the muon signal based on inclined showers, and requires some caution towards the mass-composition restrictions obtained in [34]. One may hope that in the near future Auger measurement of the muon size N_μ will allow to find the correlation factor $r(X_{\max}, N_\mu)$ with good accuracy. A particularly interesting case is given by showers with total energy around $E_c \sim 3$ EeV, where, according to Auger observations, a light nuclear composition (probably $p + He$) transits to a heavier one. In this case the correlation factor $r(E)$ changes its sign at E_c passing from a positive value below E_c to a negative one above E_c, this feature will be the 'smoking gun' for the confirmation of the mixed composition claimed by Auger.

As discussed in the Introduction, a powerful method to determine mass composition with the help of muons is given by the measurement of the muon production depth of the shower $X^{\mu}_{\max}$ [14–16]. Muons trace their parents, heavy

nuclei or protons, being produced at different height in the atmosphere and propagating rectilinearly. Therefore $X^{\mu}_{\max}$ is a measure of the mass composition. The muon flux can be measured through the Auger water-Cherenkov detectors in the inclined showers where muons give the dominant signal. Moreover, in the near future, with the Auger Prime upgrade [20], water-Cherenkov detectors will be covered by scintillation detectors and muon flux will be measured also at small zenith angles, subtracting the e-m signal.

Muons propagate rectilinearly with velocity $v \approx c$. The timing of muon signal according to detailed calculations [16] will improve the accuracy of $X^{\mu}_{\max}$ method as well as the accuracy of its correlation with X_{max}, determined from fluorescence measurements.

The problem with correlation as it is found in [34] requires the presence of nuclei heavier than Helium. Here anticipating that result of [34] will be confirmed in a more convincing way through the correlations $(X_{\max}, X^{\mu}_{\max})$, and $(X_{\max}, N_{\mu})$, we included in $p + He$ model CNO nuclei with ratios at the source He/p=0.2 and CNO/p=0.1 (both allowed by Auger data [1]). The spectra, calculated following the computation scheme of [27], show quite good agreement with experimental data of both Auger and TA. The latter, as before, are reproduced assuming a source emissivity multiplied by a factor 1.2 respect to the Auger case.

V. CONCLUSIONS

As far as mass composition is concerned there are three methods to analyse the fluorescence data: $\langle X_{\max}\rangle$, $\sigma(X_{\max})$ and the shape-fitting analysis of $N(X_{max})$ distribution [1]. As it is well known, the first two methods (moments of the $X_{\max}$ distribution) do not agree well between themselves and both disagree with the shape-fitting analysis (compare the mass composition obtained in [10] and in [1]). In this paper we used the Auger shape-fitting analysis as the most reliable and free from degeneracies, see [1].

In the shape-fitting analysis the mass composition is described in terms of four nuclei species: p, He, N (we consider it as CNO) and Fe. The results of this analysis are given as fractions of the fluxes of these four elements, which depends rather strongly on the hadronic interaction models used. The new and important result of this analysis is the very small fraction of Iron compatible with zero practically for all models of hadronic interactions. We argue that this result is natural for the standard cosmology with reionization of the universe.

Our first observation is that using QGSJet II-4 and Sybill 2.1 for the hadronic interaction model the sum of protons and Helium nuclei fractions saturates with good precision the total flux, while for EPOS-LHC it leaves more space for other elements especially at the lowest and highest energies. Thus a reasonable model could be a p+He dominated injection with a small admixture of CNO elements.

Next we made the ad hoc assumption that at present all existing detectors cannot distinguish reliably Helium nuclei from protons and we calculated the spectra for Helium and proton considering them as a single component with the same injection power-law index γ_g equal to 2.6 and 2.2 and taking the ratio He/p at the source to fit the spectra of Auger and TA. These ratios are 0.15 for $\gamma_g = 2.6$ and 0.35 for $\gamma_g = 2.2$. The calculated spectra and modification factors are shown in Figs. 3 and 4.

The highest energy part of these spectra are always dominated by protons, because high-energy He nuclei are photo-disintegrated in collisions with EBL photons. In the case of $\gamma_g = 2.6$ the observed dip is mainly produced by the proton dip: it is the canonical case of modification factor considered in section II.

In the case $\gamma_g = 2.2$ the dip at EeV energies of the spectrum is produced by both Helium and proton components. The high energy cutoff in the Auger spectrum requires a maximum acceleration energy below the GZK cutoff.

In order to account for the preliminary result on the correlation between the depth of shower maximum and the muon characteristics of the shower [34], which seems to exclude a two components spectrum with just proton and He, we included CNO nuclei in the p+He model. The CNO component seems also present in the analysis of [1] with the EPOS-LHC hadronic interaction model. The results obtained with ratios He/p=0.2 and CNO/p=0.1 are improving quite well the agreement with the observed spectrum.

We conclude emphasising that the understanding reached so far on the mass composition of UHECR is still not conclusive. The observations of mass composition are still contradictory and cannot exclude a pure light composition, while the observations of spectra agree fairly well with such hypothesis. For these reasons the high energy muon program of Auger, especially the measurement of $X^{\mu}_{\max}(E)$, will be a crucial test of the model discussed in this paper. In particular the correlation $(X_{\max}, X^{\mu}_{\max})$ at energies around $E = 3$ EeV may change its sign and it will be the strongest signal for heavy nuclei above this energy scale.

We finish with the following note.

This paper is mainly focused on the impact of the Auger analysis [1] on the mass composition problem in UHECR. We avoided the discussion of some accompanying problems. In particular we calculted the spectra at $E \geq 1$ EeV to avoid the discussion about transition from galactic to extragalactic cosmic rays. We also did not include the

(possible) cosmological evolution of the sources, which can artificially improve the agreement of theoretical spectra with observations. We hope to address these problems in a forthcoming publication.

---

[1] A. Aab et al. (Auger collaboration) Phys. Rev. D 90, 122006 (2014).
[2] K. Greisen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16** 48 (1966).
G.T. Zatsepin and V.A. Kuzmin, JETP Letters **4** 78, (1966).
[3] G.R. Blumenthal, Phys. Rev. **D1** 1596 (1970).
[4] V. Berezinsky, A.Gazizov, S. Grigorieva, Phys. Rev. **D74** 043005 (2006).
[5] V.Berezinsky, A.Gazizov, S. Grigorieva, Phys. Lett. **B612** 147 (2005).
[6] R. Aloisio, V. Berezinsky, P. Blasi, A. Gazizov, S. Grigorieva, B. Hnatyk, Astrop. Physics **27** 76 (2007).
[7] V. Verzi, Rapporteur report ICRC 2015, PoS ICRC2015 015 (2016).
[8] N.M. Gerasimova and I.L. Rozental, JETPh **41** 488 (1961).
[9] R.Aloisio, V.Berezinsky, S.Grigorieva, Astropart. Phys. **41**, 94, (2013).
[10] A. Aab et al. (Auger Collaboration), Phys. Rev. **D90** 122005 (2014).
[11] R.U.Abbasi et al (TA Collaboration), Astropart. Phys. **64** 49 (2015).
[12] K. Werner, F.M.,Liu and T. Pirtoj, Phys. Rev. **C74** 044902 (2006).
[13] S. Ostapchenko, Phys. Rev. **D74** 014026 (2006).
[14] D. Garcia-Gamez et al. (Auger Collaboration), Contribution ICRC 2011, arXiv:1107.4807.
[15] R. Conceicao for Auger Collaboration, 1307.3958. **arXiv number is now corrected**
[16] L. Collica et al. (Auger Collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. Plus 131 (2016), arXiv:1609.02498.
[17] W.D. Apel et al (KASCADE-Grande Collaboration) Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** 171104 (2011).
[18] V.S. Berezinsky, S.V. Bulanov, V.A.Dogiel, V.L.Ginzburg, V.S. Ptuskin, Astrophysics of Cosmic Rays, North Holland (1990).
[19] B. Wundheiler, Contribution ICRC 2015, PoS(ICRC2015) 324 (2015), arXiv:1509.03732.
[20] A. Aab et al. (Auger Collaboration) arXiv:1604.03637.
[21] A.A. Abdo et al (Fermi-LAT Collaboration), Phys. ReV. Lett. **104** 101101 (2015).
[22] R.Y. Liu, A.M. Taylor, X.Y. Wang, F. Aharonian, Phys. Rev. **D94** 043008 (2016).
[23] E.Gavish, D.Eichler, Astrophys.J. **822** 56 (2016).
[24] V. Berezinsky, A. Gazizov, O. Kalashev Astropart. Phys. **84** 52 (2016).
[25] I. Valino et al. (Auger Collaboration), Contribution ICRC 2015, PoS (ICRC2015) 271 (2015), arXiv:1509.03732.
[26] D. Ivanov et al. (TA Collaboration), Contribution ICRC 2015, PoS (ICRC2015) 349 (2015).
[27] R. Aloisio, V. Berezinsky, P. Blasi, JCAP **10** 020 (2014).
[28] E.-J. Ahn et al, Phys.ReV. D 80,094003 (2009).
[29] G. Hinshaw et al. (WMAP Collaboration) Astroph. J. Suppl. Ser. 180. 225 (2009)
[30] R. Adam et al. (Planck Collaboration), Astron. Astrophys. **596** A108 (2016).
[31] A. Songaila, Ap.J. **561** L153 (2001).
[32] F.W. Stecker, M.M. Malkan and S. Scully, Astrophys.J. **648** 774 (2006).
[33] P. Younk and M. Risse, Astrop. Phys. **35** 807 (2012).
[34] A. Aab et al. (Auger Collaboration) Phys. Lett. **B708** 288 (2016).
[35] A. Aab et al for Auger collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117** 192001 (2016).